

Appl. No. 10/711,196
Amtd. dated August 24, 2006
Reply to Office action of June 15, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Double Patenting

Claims 1-3, 7-13, and 18-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-2, 6-7, 9-12 of co-pending Application No. 10/605,455.

5 The applicant respectfully does not agree with this rejection and retains the right to a future rebuttal should the need arise. Some differences between the present application and co-pending Application No. 10/605,455 are the same as cited in section 2 of the remarks section of this response. However, for unrelated reasons, the applicant wishes to state for the record that co-pending Application No. 10/605,455 has been abandoned, 10 which eliminates a possible provisional double patenting situation, and making further discussion of this rejection unnecessary at this time.

Reconsideration of claims 1-3, 7-13, and 18-20 under the double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

15

2. Claim Rejections

Claims 1-8, 10-17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee, J.Y. (KR2002068004). Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Lee and admitted prior art.

20 It is acknowledged that Lee stores "a file making a PC recognize the USB LAN card in the integrated device". However, storage of a driver in the "integrated device" is not the primary feature and purpose of the invention. As stated in paragraph [0009] of the current application as published, in the prior art, if the host computer does not already have the driver for a new application device, the user must locate and install the driver manually. Lee is suggesting a solution to the problem of storing the driver on a separate 25 device, but does not teach or suggest anything other than that the user is still required to locate and install the driver himself.

Appl. No. 10/711,196
Amdt. dated August 24, 2006
Reply to Office action of June 15, 2006

However, the present application discloses a very different device. According to the present invention, "When the hub controller is electrically connected to the interface port, the computer host can retrieve the device driver of the application module through the hub controller, and can automatically install and run the device driver to control the application module to perform the predetermined operation" (paragraph [0050]). The applicant is unable to locate any teachings in Lee anticipating the independent claims 1 and 10 limitation of the device comprising firmware "simulating an autorun function of an optical disc drive to install the driver of the application device in the electronic device host". This is a physical and functional difference not found in the prior art. The fact that Lee specifically intends "not to use a CD" (abstract), would seem to eliminate any possible motivation or suggestion of "simulating an autorun function of an optical disc drive" in the reference.

Inasmuch as the allowability of dependent claims ultimately rests upon the allowability of their respective base claims, and the applicant has shown differences between the base claims and known prior art, reconsideration of claims 1-19 is respectfully requested. Claim 20 has been cancelled without disclaimer of any kind.

3. Introduction of New Claim 21.

New independent claim 21 has been introduced in this response for consideration. All limitations are supported at least by paragraphs [0043]-[0044] and figures 5 and 6. No new material has been introduced.

Appl. No. 10/711,196
Amdt. dated August 24, 2006
Reply to Office action of June 15, 2006

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: August 24, 2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Faxsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)